

AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL,  
*et al.*,  
  
*Petitioners*  
  
v.  
  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION  
AGENCY, *et al.*,  
  
*Respondents.*

1. Whether EPA’s action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for “all sectors of the economy of the United States”;
2. Whether EPA’s action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for coal mines;

3. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for suppliers of coal;
4. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for electronics manufacturing;
5. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for ethanol production;
6. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for fluorinated greenhouse gas production;
7. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for food processing;
8. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for industrial landfills;

9. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for magnesium production;

10. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for oil and natural gas systems;

11. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for sulfur hexafluoride from electrical equipment;

12. Whether EPA's action was arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, because it failed to promulgate greenhouse gas emissions reporting obligations for wastewater treatment.

DATED: February 8, 2010

/s/ Timothy D. Ballo  
Timothy D. Ballo  
David S. Baron  
Earthjustice  
1625 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Suite 702  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2212  
(202) 667-4500

Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund